

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

CHRISTINA JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHELLE KING, *Acting Commissioner,*
Social Security Administration,

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. **3:24-cv-1896-L-BV**

ORDER

On January 22, 2025, the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (“Report”) (Doc. 19) was entered, recommending that the court **dismiss without prejudice** this action, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), for failure to prosecute and comply with a court order. No objections have been filed, and the 14-day period to object after service of the Report has passed. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1)(2); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). For the reasons stated herein, the court **accepts** the Report.


Pro se Plaintiff Christina Jackson (“Plaintiff” or “Ms. Jackson”) filed her Complaint on July 24, 2024 (Doc. 3). She brings a claim against the Social Security Administration (“Defendant”) on behalf of her minor son R.J. whose disability claim was denied by Defendant. *Id.* Plaintiff is seeking to appeal the denial of R.J.’s disability claim because she contends that he has several qualifying disabilities. *Id.* Defendant filed an answer on September 19, 2024. Doc. 15. Plaintiff did not file an opening brief, and as a result, on December 4, 2024, the magistrate judge issued a show-cause order and offered her an opportunity to comply with the court’s schedule. Report 2 (citing Doc 18). Magistrate Judge Amy Burch directed “Plaintiff, no later

than December 20, [2024] to file her brief or show good cause in writing why she has not timely filed a brief.” *Id.* (citing Doc. 18).

In the show-cause order, Magistrate Judge Burch advised Ms. Jackson that if she failed to comply with her orders, “the undersigned would recommend dismissal of the case.” *Id.* As of the date of this Order, Ms. Jackson has not filed a brief or responded to the show-cause order issued by the magistrate judge. *See Docs.* 1-19. Further, Magistrate Judge Burch concluded that “[i]n sum, Plaintiff’s failure to comply with Court orders over several months—a decision solely attributable to her—coupled with her apparent indifference to lesser sanctions, necessitates dismissal.” Report 6.

Having considered the file, record in this case, and Report, the court determines that the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge are correct, and **accepts** them as those of the court. Accordingly, the court **dismisses without prejudice** this action, pursuant to Rule 41(b), as a result of Plaintiff’s failure to prosecute and comply with a court order.

It is so ordered this 18th day of February, 2025.


Sam A. Lindsay
United States District Judge